DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 866 TM 004 833

AUTHOR Freeberg, Norman E.; Echternacht, Gary J.
TITLE Development of Measures for the Assessment of Delinquent Adolescents: A Pilot Study of Predictive Validity Based on a Sample of Pre-Trial Detainees. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
REPORT NO ETS-PR-75-7
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); Adolescents; *Attitude Tests; *Cognitive Tests; Correlation; Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Delinquents; Males; *Occupational Tests; *Predictive Validity; Predictor Variables; Questionnaires; Reading Tests; Test Validity

ABSTRACT

This report explores the validity of measures for eventual use in assessing attitudinal and cognitive skills of delinquent adolescents. Ten measures of a battery along with a reading test were administered to adolescent males, 14 to 18 years of age, held in pretrial detention. The 11 tests were validated against 37 criterion variables encompassing post-detention performance outcomes in areas of social, community, and job adjustments. Criterion information was obtainable from about one-quarter of the sample who could be followed up about 6 to 11 months after release. Some descriptive characteristics were: they read at a "functionally illiterate" level; 67 percent had obtained full-time employment mostly in low paying, poor quality jobs; they adjusted fairly in terms of family and community relations, and expressed a desire to stay out of trouble. In terms of validation content, eight measures produced patterns of significant validities to support their potential for further development as guidance tools applicable to adolescent offenders. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111866

PR-75-7

Final Report

Development of Measures for the Assessment of Delinquent Adolescents: A Pilot Study of Predictive Validity Based on a Sample of Pre-Trial Detainees

Norman E. Freeberg

and

Gary J. Echternacht

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

March 1975

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	i
Summary	ii
Introduction	1
Procedure	
A. Description of the Test Battery	2
B. Description of the Outcome (Criterion) Measures	4
C. Sample	5
D. Data Analysis	7
Results and Discussion	
A. Pattern of Test Relationships	8
B. Description of Post-Detention Performance	10
C. Test-Criterion Relationships (Validities)	13
References	27
Appendix	

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Ms. Kathy Leach, Director of Counseling for Essex Youth House, and the members of the counseling staff for their efforts in test administration and follow-up data collection. Ms. Inge Stiebritz was particularly helpful in organizing the data sets and preparing the computer programs for data analyses.

Development of Measures for the Assessment of Delinquent Adolescents: A Pilot Study of Predictive Validity Based on a Sample of Pre-Trial Detainees[1]

Norman E. Freeberg and Gary J. Echternacht
Educational Testing Service

SUMMARY

This pilot study was intended, primarily, to explore the validity of the measures of a test battery for eventual use in assessing attitudinal and cognitive skills of delinquent adolescents. Ten measures of that battery (originally designed for individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds) along with a conventional reading test, were administered to a sample of 191 adolescent males, 14 to 18 years of age, held in pre-trial detention at the Essex County Youth House in New Jersey. The 11 tests were validated against 37 criterion variables encompassing post-detention performance outcomes in areas of social, community and job adjustments.

Criterion information was obtainable from 51 former detainees of the tested sample, who could be followed up about 6 to 10 months after release and were willing to cooperate in the study (on which bases alone there were likely to be selective biases in a 27% follow-up sample). In descriptive terms, some of the more prominent features characterizing this detainee sample indicated that they read at a grade level that denotes "functional illiteracy" (mean reading grade of 4.1); that 6[illegible]%

[1]This study was conducted under contract with Essex County Youth House of New Jersey through funds provided by a grant from the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency of New Jersey.

had obtained full-time employment after release, but at relatively low-paying, poor quality jobs which seem to be what they expected to achieve for themselves; that they seemed to be adjusting moderately well in terms of their family and community relations, as well as expressing a strong desire to keep out of trouble. However, a major area of weakness was denoted in their poor planning ability for short-term and long-term vocational goals and in knowledge of how to achieve these goals.

The more pertinent findings, in terms of the validation intent, revealed that eight measures produce patterns of significant and meaningful validities tending to support their potential for further development as guidance tools applicable to adolescent offenders. Of that group, tests of cognitive-verbal ability were predominant in the form of Practical Reasoning Skills that involve simulated job tasks (i.e., map reading, zip coding mail and sorting file cards) and reading ability (paragraph comprehension). Two other measures of value dealt with vocationally-oriented cognitive skills designated as Job Knowledge and Job-Seeking Skills, while the two remaining tests with acceptable validity tap attitudinal constructs of Self-Esteem and Attitude Toward Authority.

Development of Measures for the Assessment of Delinquent Adolescents: A Pilot Study of Predictive Validity Based on a Sample of Pre-Trial Detainees

Norman E. Freeberg and Gary J. Echternacht

Educational Testing Service

INTRODUCTION

The provision of effective services for youthful offenders can often depend on the ability to assess their cognitive, attitudinal, and social capabilities at various stages in the rehabilitation process; beginning, where possible, as early as pre-trial detention. Judicial decisions and correctional efforts, in the form of counseling, training, and job placement might be improved where properly designed assessment tools provide meaningful and valid information.

Research and development projects dealing with educational and vocational rehabilitation of criminal offenders have been numerous over the past decade, but comparatively few have dealt specifically with juveniles or applied their efforts to the pre-trial detention setting (Rovner-Preczenik, 1973). Those few relevant studies that have been reported (Youth House, Inc., 1967; National Committee on Children and Youth, 1971; Orchinik, 1969) have shown little evidence of any attempt to cope with behavioral assessment problems that are often intrinsic to the services such institutions provide as well as the evaluation of their program impact. Formal (published) measures available for such purposes have often been recognized as questionable when applied to adolescents or young adults, who are in large proportion culturally, economically, and educationally disadvantaged minority group members who function at low verbal skill levels (Karp & Sigel, 1965; Lennon, 1964). Design

inadequacies of conventional measures, applied to those groups, may be found in their format, content, mode of presentation, normative data, and lack of demonstrated validity.

In an effort to help fill the measurement gap, selected paper-and-pencil tests from a battery of attitudinal and reasoning measures, developed for use with disadvantaged minority group adolescents enrolled in manpower training programs (Freeberg, 1970, 1974), were considered appropriate for experimental application to a sample of delinquent adolescents in order to determine their value as potential guidance tools. That set of measures administered to male offenders being held in pre-trial detention was to be validated against post-detention outcomes dealing with a number of community, family, and job adjustments. A variety of outcome measures encompassing those areas of performance--also developed originally for use with enrollees in manpower training programs (Freeberg & Reilly, 1971)--served as the criteria for test validation purposes. Although the primary intent of this study is to determine the predictive validity of a battery of tests, an opportunity is also provided for an examination of the applicability of a wide range of outcome variables, along with a descriptive view of ways in which a sample of former detainees managed to adjust over a period of months following their release.

PROCEDURE

A. Description of the Test Battery

Ten measures of the newly-developed battery were chosen as most suitable for administration to the study sample, based on previous results regarding their measurement properties and the pertinence of the constructs for potential guidance uses in a pre-trial detention setting. These consist of four (4) attitudinal measures designated and defined as follows:

(1) Attitude Toward Authority (12 items): in which scenes depicting responses of an adolescent to authority figures (e.g., teacher, policeman, parents, judge, etc.) are used to elicit the degree of pro- or anti-authority feelings by the respondent.

(2) Self-Esteem (16 items): depicts situations pictorially in which the respondent indicates the degree to which he feels himself "worthy" of the desirable outcomes (getting a diploma, job, promotion, etc.).

(3) Motivation for Vocational Achievement (10 items): presents statements (item stems) that bear on the desirability of seeking and maintaining employment. These require the individual to respond (Likert-Scale format) in terms of the degree of agreement with the statement.

(4) Deferred Gratification (16 items): presents statements dealing with the willingness to delay present reward for future gain to which the respondent indicates his degree of agreement.

Three (3) measures deal with vocational orientation in the form of:

(5) Job Knowledge (27 items): requires answers to multiple-choice items regarding a variety of jobs (e.g., carpenter, auto mechanic, policeman) in terms of their educational requirements, starting salary, primary task performed, hours of work, place where work is performed, and tools utilized.

(6) Job Seeking Skills (17 items): presents multiple-choice items dealing with ways of looking for jobs, some of which entail interpretation of newspaper want ads and portions of job application blanks.

(7) Job Holding Skills (11 items): depicts situations that might be encountered on a job with regard to supervisors' requests, appropriate dress, punctuality, etc., for which the respondent chooses the reply he would give, or the most appropriate behavior called for, in that situation.

The three remaining tests are intended to measure reasoning skills based on the following of directions in simulated job situations:

(8) Practical Reasoning - Zip Coding (10 items): provides the respondent with information needed for a hypothetical post office job requiring him to sort mail using zip codes. Questions are presented in a multiple-choice format pertaining to that task.

(9) Practical Reasoning - Map Reading (10 items): presents a map illustrating several square city blocks along with information needed to answer multiple-choice questions about delivering materials to different locations shown on the map.

(10) Practical Reasoning - File Card Sorting (10 items): requires the use of a set of file cards describing characteristics of fictitious job applicants. From these, the respondent is to "select" applicants who meet specified requirements as defined in multiple-choice items.

The items for each measure of the battery appear in separate booklets containing one item to a page with responses marked in the booklet itself. Combinations of pictorial and verbal material are utilized and all item stems and response alternative are orally presented. The measures are suitable for individual or small group administration with no time limits imposed. Verbal material approximates a 5th grade reading level, while content and linguistic style are geared to an adolescent or young adult audience.

Administered along with the ten measures of the battery was the Stanford Achievement Test of Paragraph Completion (Kelly, Madden, Gardner, & Rudman, 1964). This 11th test was carried through all phases of the analysis as a means of contrasting results obtained with the battery against a convention, formal measure of verbal skill.

B. Description of the Outcome (Criterion) Measures

The measures of post-detention performance outcomes, used as criteria for test validition, are conveniently summarized under three major categories:

(1) Social-Community Adjustments - consisting of 12 measures that deal with family adjustment (e.g., getting along with the family; financial contribution), community adjustment (e.g., trouble with the police, criminal convictions, problems with other people in the community, number of clubs or community organizations in which time is spent), and personal adjustment (e.g., general health, willingness to save money, assessment by a Child Services Officer).

(2) Work Experience and Job Adjustment - encompasses 11 variables

based on amount and type of employment, its quality, hours worked, time spent on the job, job performance in terms of raises, promotions, and salary level, and perceptions of satisfaction with the job.

(3) Work Planning and Motivation - is defined by 11 variables dealing with time and effort expended to obtain employment (e.g., in terms of time required to find a job, the number of sources used, places interviewed, applications filed, and visits to State Employment Service) and level of planning ability for short-term and long-term employment.

Several additional variables that do not fit conveniently under the three major categories above were worth incorporating in order to round out the picture of post-detention outcomes. These are mobility (i.e., number of places lived since leaving Youth House), number of different family members with whom the former detainee resides and the number of attempts by the interviewer to contact him.

The resulting 37 criterion measures were incorporated in a questionnaire designed for administration to former detainees, orally, on an individual basis. Better appreciation of the details of the measures, their content, and scoring is obtained in the Results section and from the questionnaire items as shown in the Appendix.

C. Sample

The sample tested in the initial data collection phase, using the measures of the Battery and the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), was composed of 191 male detainees residing in the Essex County Youth House (Newark, New Jersey) in mid- to late 1973. This pre-trial detention center houses adolescents awaiting judicial disposition of the offenses leading to their arrest, during which time a variety of academic, recreational, and guidance services are provided. Those selected for

sample inclusion had been detained at the Youth House for at least two weeks. All were minority group members with 94% of the sample identifiable as Black and 6% as Hispanic.

The follow-up sample, obtained from the 191 males initially tested, consisted of 51 former detainees who were released from Essex County Youth House (i.e., not sentenced directly to a prison facility), who could be located about 6 months to one year after leaving EYH and who were also willing to respond to the questionnaire. Counselors at EYH, who were responsible for all aspects of data collection, were to administer each questionnaire individually to the respondent and to pay him five dollars for his cooperation. This proportionally small group of follow-up respondents (i.e., 27% of the original sample) carries a significant rask of sample bias in that they are likely to represent the former detainees who are easiest to locate and most willing to participate. Increased sample homogeneity is also likely in a population that is already relatively homogeneous in terms of ethnic, educational, and social background. Furthermore, such a small sample serves to limit considerably the type of analytical techniques that can be applied.

The 51 post-detention respondents ranged in age from 14 to 18 years with a mean age of 16.1 and had been out of the Youth House an average of 8.8 months when they responded to the criterion questionnaire. Sixty-seven percent of the sample (N=34) had obtained some type of full-time employment after leaving the Youth House[1] and constitute the sample size for all aspects of the analyses concerned with job-related performance criteria[2]. Mean reading ability of the group on the SAT Paragraph

---

[1] Defined as more than 20 hours of work for one week or more---in accordance with the U. S. Dept. of Labor's standard definition.

[2] It can be pointed out that the figure of 33% who never obtained employment, as found in this sample, approximates the U. S. Dept. of Labor estimates of about 35% unemployment for Black teenagers during much of 1973.

Meaning subtest was at the 4.1 grade level. This places the detainees at a reading level more than one grade below that found for a sample of school dropouts enrolled in a youth-work training program (Freeberg & Reilly, 1972) and indicates that a large proprotion of these adolescents function at a verbal level customarily defined as "functional illiteracy" (a condition not likely to facilitate long-term vocational or educational adjustment).

In soliciting participation of detainees for either the initial or follow-up study phases, it was stressed that their cooperation was entirely voluntary as was their response to any particular portion of the tests or questionnaire materials.

D. Data Analysis

Given the size of the available longitudinal sample, the nature of the criterion data and the primary intent of the study (i.e., the determination of test validities), three types of analyses seem most applicable. The first, based on the N of 191, involves a brief examination of the test battery itself in terms of the test intercorrelations and resulting underlying dimensions obtained by factor analysis. Such results provide the opportunity for a very general contrast in test performance between this sample of youthful offenders and prior results obtained from similar analyses with school dropouts in a youth-work training program.

The second is a simple descriptive summary of the performance of the post-detention sample of 51, based on the means and standard deviations of the criterion variables (the small sample size, as well as the occurrence of missing data throughout the sample, precluded any attempts at more extensive multivariate analyses of the criteria).

The third, and major focus of the analysis, involves computing the zero-order r's between the tests and the criterion variables (i.e., the test validities).

For better clarity of presentation, the correlations to be reported are the significant ones obtained, and only for those measures of the battery that produced a greater than chance number of such significant validities. Since this pilot study is largely exploratory, correlations at both the .05 and .10 confidence level are presented in order to examine a broad pattern of validities and to identify tests of potential value for further development.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Pattern of Test Relationships

The intercorrelations of the ten measures of the experimental test battery and the conventional reading comprehension test (SAT) are shown in Table 1.

In general, the pattern of test intercorrelations is similar to that obtained with previous (non-offender) samples. As might have been expected, those subtests that involve essentially cognitive tasks (i.e., Job Knowledge, Job Seeking Skills, and the three Practical Reasoning measures) tend to be most highly related to each other and to the SAT. Attitudinal measures are, similarly, most highly intercorrelated with one another. However, except for the Attitude Toward Authority test, each of the attitude measures (i.e., Self-Esteem, Deferred Gratification, Motivation for Vocational Achievement, and Job Holding Skills) also show significant correlations with reading grade level and the other cognitive skill measures. In contrast to results for a non-offender male sample (Freeberg,

Table 1

Test Intercorrelations

(N=191)

Job Knowledge 1	Attitude Toward Authority 2	Self-Esteem 3	Deferred Gratification 4	Motivation for Vocational Achievement 5	Job Seeking Skills 6	Job Holding Skills 7	Practical Reasoning Zip Code 8	Practical Reasoning Map 9	Practical Reasoning File Card 10	SAT (Paragraph Completion) 11	
-	.13	.30	.24	.41	.41	.27	.32	.22	.35	.47	1
	-	.15	.25	.27	.13	.16	.12	.07	.12	.09	2
		-	.09	.40	.26	.37	.32	.21	.27	.28	3
			-	.35	.33	.25	.13	-.01	.19	.26	4
				-	.39	.42	.30	.26	.40	.35	5
					-	.49	.45	.41	.50	.48	6
						-	.43	.32	.45	.30	7
							-	.63	.61	.34	8
								-	.65	.28	9
									-	.38	10
										-	11

1974), these latter correlations prove to be somewhat higher overall. Any number of interpretations may be advanced to explain why cognitive skills might have more bearing on the ability of delinquent individuals to display "appropriate" attitudinal responses. But, this comparison should be tempered by recognition of the large difference in reading level between

the two samples (including lower means and smaller variances on the attitudinal measures for the present study sample) and that reading ability in the non-offender sample had been based on grade level scores (unequated) from either the SAT or the California Achievement Test.

The pattern of test relationships is appreciated more readily from a brief examination of the factors obtained from the 11 x 11 matrix as shown in Table 2.*

Table 2

Rotated Factor Loadings for Eleven Measures[1]

Test	Factor I Positive Attitude	Factor II Reasoning Skills	Factor III Vocational Orientation Skills
1. Job Knowledge	08	17	<u>75</u>
2. Attitude toward Auth.	<u>85</u>[2]	08	11
3. Self-Esteem	<u>31</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>31</u>
4. Def. Gratification	<u>53</u>	- 12	<u>49</u>
5. Mot. Voc. Achiev.	<u>51</u>	27	<u>48</u>
6. Job Seeking Skills	15	<u>47</u>	<u>59</u>
7. Job Holding Skills	<u>35</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>33</u>
8. PR Zip Code	09	<u>81</u>	19
9. PR Map	- 04	<u>88</u>	05
10. PR File Card	11	<u>78</u>	28
11. SAT	- 01	23	<u>77</u>

[1] decimal points omitted

[2] loadings of interpretable magnitude are underscored

*Based on a principal components solution with varimax rotation to orthogonality (Kaiser, 1954).

Of the three factors extracted and rotated, Factor I, Positive Attitude, is the "cleanest" or most readily defined, with loadings of interpretable magnitude (i.e., .30 or greater) confined exclusively to the five attitudinal measures and dominated by Attitude Toward Authority. Factor II, designated as Reasoning Skill, is defined primarily by the very large loadings on the three Practical Reasoning tests (essentially direction-following ability), along with smaller, but interpretable, loadings on the cognitive Job Seeking Skills measure and the attitudinal Job Holding Skills. Absence of an interpretable loading for reading ability (SAT) on the factor is notable and is consonant with the general observation made above from visual inspection of the inter-r patterns of the Battery. Reading skill becomes involved in the structure, in a major way, only in Factor III (Vocational Orientation Skills) where it is accompanied closely by the cognitive vocationally-oriented measures requiring knowledge about jobs and how to go about obtaining them (JK and JSS tests). To some extent, the factor also contains an attitudinal component involving all of the attitude measures except for the Attitude Toward Authority test.

These factor patterns, while showing broad similarities to prior results, for non-offender samples indicate that pro- or anti-authority perceptions and the ability to read (as a specific cognitive skill) play dominant but relatively independent roles that appear to be somewhat unique for a group of male offenders.

B. Description of Post-Detention Performance

Scores on the criterion variables, subsumed under the three major categories of outcome measures that are to be used for test validation purposes (i.e., Social-Community Adjustments, Work Experience and Adjustment, and Work Planning-Motivation) can also provide a descriptive (even

if one-dimensional) cursory view of what the former detainees accomplished after they left Essex County Youth House.

(1) Work Experience and Job Adjustment-are represented by the outcome measures summarized in Table 3. (The questionnaire item, from which the score for each measure is derived, is shown in the Appendix.)

Table 3

Summary of Work Experience and Adjustment Outcome Variables

Criterion Variable	Mean	S.D.
Extent of Employment (3 pt. scale)	1.9	0.7
White Collar/Blue Collar (Job Setting)	1.4	0.5
Job Quality Level (3 pt. scale)	1.7	0.6
Hrs. Work/Week	30.7	11.4
Length of Stay on Job (Weeks)	12.1	8.5
# Jobs Held (Since ECYH)	1.4	2.2
Salary Raise (No/Yes)	1.3	0.5
Promotion (No/Yes)	1.1	0.3
Job Satisfaction (10-item scale)	19.0	3.5
Salary Level (Earnings/Hr.)	1.9	0.3
Met Job Expectations (3 pt. scale)	2.6	0.7

As a group, the former detainees were likely to have obtained employment for 20 hours a week or more over the period of about 9 months since they left the Youth House (i.e., 67% of the group did so). Those who obtained employment were somewhat more likely to be employed in a white collar job setting although at relatively low paying and poor quality jobs which they held for 12 weeks, working an average of 31 hours per week. They

tended to hold more than one job (an average of 1.4 jobs) and, as would be logical for the relatively brief post-detention period covered, they were unlikely to obtain raises (i.e., 29% reported one or more raises) and even less likely to be promoted (i.e., only 15% reported obtaining a promotion).

The overall satisfaction with their jobs could be described as approximately neutral (M = 19.0 for a 10-item scale with a range of 10 to 30 scale points) although the jobs were seen as being largely what they would expect them to be (M = 2.6 for having Met Job Expectations).

(2) Social-Community Adjustments - as summarized in Table 4, indicate that in their personal lives, the group claims to be saving money to some extent. They are not generally bothered by health problems, nor do they make frequent visits to a physician (i.e., about one visit since leaving Youth House, with the very large standard deviation resulting from considerable positive skewness in the distribution and indicating that most former detainees have not seen a physician at all).

They also claim to be getting along with their family fairly well and that they contribute about 43% of their earnings to the family income. The mean rating of the former detainee by a parent or guardian is almost precisely neutral* (M = 2.1 on a 3 pt. scale).

In items of community adjustment, the former detainee tends to see more than one person in the community as giving him a "hard time" (M = 1.6), have somewhat less than one instance of trouble with the police (M = 0.8), and an average of 0.5 convictions. In each of these variables the

---

* The family rating, originally obtained on 4 scale items, with 3 response points per item, was of doubtful value as a measure since most respondents rated all items with the same scale value (i.e., effectively no discrimination from item to item). Thus, a single scale item score was used since it could be considered representative of the total scale.

Table 4

Summary of Social-Community Adjustment Outcome Variables

Criterion Variable	Mean	S.D.
Get Along with Family (3 pt. scale)	2.7	0.6
Amt. Contrib. to Family Income (per $10 earned)	4.3	2.2
# People in Community Giving Hard Time	1.4	1.3
Health Problems (No/Yes)	1.2	0.4
# Times Seen Doctor (Since ECYH)	1.1	2.2
Amt. Money Saved (3 pt. scale)	2.0	0.8
Amt. Trouble with Police (4 pt. scale)	0.8	1.0
# Convictions (4 pt. scale)	0.5	0.9
Import. of Keeping Out of Trouble (3 pt. scale)	2.7	0.5
# Clubs or Community Places Spend Time	0.8	0.9
Family Rating (3 pt. scale)	2.1	0.6
Youth Worker Rating (3 pt. scale)	2.3	0.7

relatively large standard deviations shown result from positive skewness in those distributions such that most people (53%) report no one giving them a "hard time," with none (48%) or only one (26%) instance of trouble with the police and none (70%) or one (14%) instance of a conviction. In general, the group expresses a strong desire to keep out of trouble with the police (M = 2.7); while the Youth Worker tended to rate their adjustment toward the positive side of the scale (M = 2.3 on the 3 point scale).

(3) Work Planning and Motivation - as defined by the variables summarized in Table 5, indicate that it took the average former detainee, who found a job, slightly more than 2 1/2 weeks to do so after leaving the Youth House

(i.e., 18.5 days), and the use of between one and two job sources (M = 1.4 sources), with the most frequently used sources cited as friends or people in the neighborhood, and going directly to the company and asking about a job.

Table 5

Summary of Work Planning and Motivation Outcome Variables

Criterion Variable	Mean	S.D.
Time to Find First Job (#days)	18.5	13.0
# Sources Used in Search	1.4	1.1
# Places Interviewed	2.2	2.5
# Places Filed Application	1.7	2.0
Level of Short-Term Plans (4 pt. scale)	1.9	0.6
Relevance of Job Choice	1.7	0.5
Self Assessment of Job Knowledge (3 pt. scale)	2.1	0.8
# Relevant Job Search Options	0.8	0.9
Quality of Long-Range Plans (3 pt. scale)	0.6	0.8
Obtained or Working on GED (No/Yes)	1.6	0.5
# Visits to State Employment Service	0.7	1.3

In their job search efforts, they obtained interviews with slightly more than two potential employers before obtaining the first job (M = 2.2) and had an opportunity to file job applications in slightly fewer than two places (M = 1.7). Attempts to visit State Employment Service, as part of the search for available jobs, were rare (M = 0.7 visits). Extreme positive skewness in these latter three variables produces the disproportionally large standard deviations and indicates that for most of the sample there

were fewer than the mean number of interviews obtained, applications filed, or visits to SES.

In planning for the next or desired job, the quality of short-term plans is at the low or "poor" quality end of the scale (M = 1.9), indicating that former detainees as a group either have no plans or will just look for a job without attempts at some form of training. Most can, however, provide relevant reasons for selecting a desired job and also feel that they have a moderate degree of knowledge about how to perform that job. Their ability to describe specific methods by which they would go about obtaining such a job (in terms of number of relevant search options) seems relatively poor. The mean of 0.8 relevant responses indicates that a large proportion (47%) simply did not know what to do in order to obtain a desired next job. A query regarding longer range plans produces an even poorer level of planning (M = 0.6) with 53% having no knowledge of what they might plan for, although they are slightly inclined as a group to supplement future plans by attempting to work on (or to have obtained) a general equivalency high school diploma (GED).

Values for the three remaining criterion variables (not readily categorized above) are as follows and are largely self-explanatory:

Criterion Variable	Mean	S.D.
# Places Lived Since ECYH	1.6	0.9
# Categories of Relatives Living With	2.4	0.7
# Contacts to Locate Former Detainee	1.4	0.5

C. Test-Criterion Relationships (Validities)

In this primary phase of the analysis, the test-criterion relationships presented below indicate which measures of the test battery would be of

greatest value as predictors of performance outcomes. The validity coefficients are shown only for those measures of the battery resulting in two or more correlations with the criteria that are significant at the .05 confidence level (i.e., a greater than chance number of significant r's). Along with these is a separate listing of validities at the less stringent .10 level. Seven measures of the battery and the SAT Paragraph Comprehension Test met the significance requirement and are described below in the approximate order of their number and magnitude of significant relationships displayed. Among that set of measures, the cognitive-verbal ones tend to have the primary ranking (i.e., two of the Practical Reasoning measures, SAT and Job Knowledge), while the Job Seeking Skills and Practical Reasoning measure (Zip Coding) and two attitude measures (Self-Esteem and Attitude Toward Authority) fall in behind these with fewer significant (.05) validities. The remaining measures, all three of which are attitudinal (Deferred Gratification, Motivation for Vocational Achievement, and Job Holding Skills), failed to achieve any validities beyond chance expectancy.

(1) Practical Reasoning: Map Reading (PRM) - is readily identified as the measure with the best validities over a relatively wide range of post-detention outcomes. From the overall pattern of r's listed below at the .05 and .10 significance levels, it is apparent that the individual scoring higher on this measure is more likely to achieve better job success in several ways (more hours worked, higher salary level and greater knowledge of how to seek future employment), to claim better health (less likely to have health problems and to make fewer visits to a physician), and to display better social-community adjustment as reflected in fewer convictions, less trouble with police or with other

people in the community, and a greater willingness to save money. Interestingly, where the two criterion measures of Number of Contacts Required and Number of Categories of Relatives Living With appear as predictable (in this instance and with other tests), the relationships are uniformly in terms of superior test performance being shown by those more difficult to find and those who live with fewer different family members (i.e., suggesting possible benefits of less crowded home conditions).

.05 Significance Level		.10 Significance Level	
Criterion	r	Criterion	r*
# Rel. Job Search Options	.54	Meet Job Expectations	.33
Hrs. Worked/Wk.	.52	# Relations Living With	-.31
Salary Level	.42	# Contacts to Locate	.30
# Convictions	-.37	Amt. Trouble with Police	-.26
Amount Saved	.35	Health Problems	-.25
# Times Seen Doctor	-.31	# People Giving Hard Time	-.22

(2) Reading Grade Level (SAT) - although a published test used for comparative purposes and not part of the battery under evaluation, does show up as one of the superior predictors. In many ways its pattern of validities is similar to that found above for the P R, Map test. Thus, higher levels of reading skill are associated with higher levels of present or planned employment (i.e., obtaining employment, salary raises, presenting more relevant job search options, getting promoted) and better social-community adjustment (less trouble with police and community members, fewer convictions, getting along better with the family, and saving money).

* r's of similar or greater magnitude occasionally found for the .10 level, in comparison to those at the .05 level, are simply the result of differences in sample size.

.05 Significance Level		.10 Significance Level	
Criterion	r	Criterion	r
Extent of Employment	.48	# Places Interviewed	.27
# Rel. Job Search Options	.48	Promotion	.27
Amount Saved	.38	Get Along with Family	.24
Salary Raise	.36	# Convictions	-.23
Amount Trouble with Police	-.33		
# People Giving Hard Time	-.31		

(3) Practical Reasoning: File Card Sorting (PRF) - as the third-ranked test in overall validity, produces some of its better predictive correlations with a scattered group of adjustment criteria that touch on health (higher test scores associated with fewer physician visits), family life (higher scores associated with fewer categories of relatives in the home), and community adjustment (better test performance associated with fewer post-detention convictions).

In terms of job success and adjustment, however, a higher level of ability on this measure is associated with less job satisfaction ($r = -.35$) --a result that holds wherever a significant relationship appears for this criterion (i.e., for the PRZ and JSS tests). In a similar way, for the criterion of number of clubs or community centers at which the former detainee spends time, where a test is related to that outcome, it is in a negative direction. Thus, not only is it negatively related in this instance to PRF ($r = -.31$) but, as will be seen, to PRZ and Self-Esteem as well. The implication might be drawn that there is a tendency for those of superior cognitive ability and more positive self perceptions to spend a greater

amount of their time in pursuits other than going to clubs or community centers (i.e., possibly devoting time to work or schooling instead). There is some indirect evidence from another source that tends to support the present finding. Caplan (1966) using a similar measure based on number of memberships in clubs, community centers, etc., found it to be one of the best predictors of later adjustment for adolescents; the relationship being a positive one against a delinquency criterion.

.05 Significance Level		.10 Significance Level	
Criterion	r	Criterion	r
# Times Seen a Doctor	-.44	# Jobs Held	-.29
# Rel. Job Search Options	.39	# Contacts Required	.28
# of Relations Living With	-.38	# Places Filed Applic.	-.28
Job Satisfaction	-.35		
# Clubs or Com.Ctrs. Spend time	-.31		
# Convictions	-.30		

(4) Job Knowledge (JK) - results in validities which indicate that former detainees scoring high on the measure are more likely to do better in terms of employment (extent and quality) and social-community adjustment (fewer people in the community giving him a hard time, greater intent to keep out of trouble, having less trouble with police, and saving more money). They tend slightly, however, not to feel that they met their job expectations and to report a greater expenditure of effort in their job search--i.e., having to be interviewed in more places and to file more applications before finding their first job (i.e., more selective in jobs they were willing to accept?)

.05 Significance Level		.10 Significance Level	
Criterion	r	Criterion	r
# People Giving Hard Time	-.35	Met Job Expectations	-.29
Job Quality	.33	Amount Saved	.28
Extent of Employment	.32	# Places Interviewed	.24
# Places Lived	.30	# Places Filed Applic.	.24
Import Keep Out of Trouble	.29	Amt. Trouble with Police	-.23

(5) Self-Esteem (SE) - as the best of the attitude measures results in relationships that bear on social-community adjustments, such that the individual displaying stronger feelings of self worth, in different situations, is more likely to get along with his family, spend time in fewer clubs or community centers, and to have fewer convictions after release from detention. In terms of the several job criteria predicted, higher self-esteem is most likely to be associated with having held fewer jobs (implying possible job "stability", since this criterion is negatively predicted where it appears as significant--i.e., for PRF and PRZ), with working more hours and providing more relevant job search options. But, as indicated for other tests, a higher self-esteem score also indicates that he is significantly less likely to feel that he met his job expectations.

.05 Significance Level		.10 Significance Level	
Criterion	r	Criterion	r
# Jobs Held	-.42	# Hrs. Worked/Week	.31
Get Along with Family	.41	# Contacts Required	.28
Met Job Expectations	-.35	Rel. of Job Search Strat.	.26
# Clubs and Com. Ctrs.	-.29	# Convictions	-.23

(6) Job Seeking Skills (JSS) - shows a set of validities oriented primarily toward community adjustment, with those scoring higher on the test expressing a stronger desire to keep out of trouble, reporting problems with fewer community members and, to a slight degree, incurring fewer convictions. An outcome that is most predictable from the measure is the very logical one of being able to provide better (more relevant) job search options (r = .40), along with the equally sensible positive relationship to Number of Visits to State Employment Service, as part of their job search (r = .27).

.05 Significance Level		.10 Significance Level	
Criterion	r	Criterion	r
# Rel. Job Search Options	.40	Job Satisfaction	-.25
# People Giving Hard Time	-.39	# Convictions	-.25
Import. Keep Out of Trouble	.27	Health Problems	-.24
# Visits to SES	.27		

(7) Practical Reasoning: Zip Coding (PRZ) - constitutes the lowest ranking measure among those of the cognitive skills group and is marked by its rather spotty validities. They do, nevertheless, help to reinforce the more coherent patterns and stronger relationships found for the other, more valid tests of the battery. Thus, higher scores on this reasoning measure by detainees tend to be predictive, primarily, of ability to provide more relevant job search options, to spend time in fewer clubs or community centers, and to have seen a physician less frequently. As was found in previous validity patterns of the cognitive measures, there is an indication that higher scores on the PRZ measure are associated with better job

performance in terms of greater length of stay on a job and fewer jobs held, but coupled with less job satisfaction (although only at the .10 level for this test). There is also confirmation of the consistent finding of a negative relationship between the tests and the criterion of number of different categories of relatives with whom the individual resides. Number of places interviewed or applications filed are the only criteria that show marked inconsistencies in being both positively (as in this case) and negatively predicted by the tests. But, in all instances, those validities appear at no better than the .10 significance level, which reflects the greater likelihood of chance error and the need for greater caution in their interpretation to begin with.

.05 Significance Level		.10 Significance Level	
Criterion	r	Criterion	r
Rel. of Job Search Options	.48	# Jobs Held	-.32
# Clubs & Comm. Ctrs.	-.42	# Places Interviewed	-.30
# Times Seen Doctor	-.34	# Job Applic. Filed	-.30
		Length of Stay on Job	.29
		# Relatives Live With	-.27
		Job Satisfaction	-.27

(8) Attitude Toward Authority (AA) - as the minimally valid test in the set of potentially useful measures (i.e., the fewest r's at the .05 significance level), achieves its two best validitites with the adjustment criteria of Importance of Keeping Out of Trouble (r = .35) and Number of Visits to a Doctor (r = -.32). Of note, however, is a meaningful pattern of relationships resulting from a relatively large number of validities at

the .10 level that are at least suggestive of the overall potential value of this attitude measure. Thus, in addition to the significant relationships to the two personal adjustment criteria, there is limited evidence that those former detainees who express more favorable (pro-) authority attitudes also adjust better in terms of family and community (less trouble with police, fewer convictions for crimes, greater contribution to family income), show better job orientation in terms of superior job planning skills (short-term and long-term), choose more relevant job search options, and have a greater likelihood of obtaining a promotion on their jobs.

.05 Significance Level		.10 Significance Level	
Criterion	r	Criterion	r
Import. Keep Out of Trouble	.35	Time to Find First Job	.31
# Times Seen Doctor	-.32	Short-Term Job Plans	.31
		# Rel. Job Search Options	.31
		Long-Term Plans	.29
		Financial Contrib. to Family	.28
		# Relatives Live with	-.28
		Job Promotion	.27
		# Places Filed Applic.	.25
		Amt. Trouble with Police	-.23
		# Convictions	-.23

The validities, obtained for the group of measures discussed above, not only display levels and patterns of significance that are superior

for certain of them as predictors (i.e., primarily the cognitive-verbal ones), but serve to point up those types of post-detention performance outcomes that are consistently most predictable from that variety of test constructs. Prominent among these are: (a) the community adjustment criteria involving the importance that the former detainee places on keeping out of trouble, amount of difficulty with other people in the community, number of clubs or community centers at which he spends time, number of convictions and the amount of trouble with police; (b) employment criteria dealing with the extent of employment (i.e., whether or not the former detainee has worked full-time or was working at the time of the interview) and number of jobs held; (c) personal-social adjustment outcomes of money saved and number of visits to a doctor; and (d) the single most predictable criterion of all--number of relevant job search options that the individual could provide.

Other criteria hold the possibility of proving more predictable—especially some of the job-related ones such as raises and promotions--if sample size were more adequate (N of only 34 for the employed subsample) and the follow-up time period were sufficient to allow such criteria to differentiate better, between former detainees, in terms of work performance.

Of primary importance in the findings of this limited pilot study, are the logical and interpretable validity patterns obtained, at moderate levels of relationship, using a variety of meaningful performance criteria. Of additional importance, is a distinct similarity in the comparative validities of the different tests when contrasted with previous findings from larger samples of school-dropout, disadvantaged adolescents enrolled in a youth-work training program (Freeberg, 1974). In essence, the best

validities of the test battery had formerly been found to result for the three Practical Reasoning measures along with the Job Knowledge and Job-Seeking Skills measures; while a reasonable but lesser degree of value was shown for the two measures of Self-Esteem and Attitude Toward Authority. Only the attitude measure of Job-Holding Skills, which had proven to be of value previously, failed to hold up for this sample of adolescents in pre-trial detention.* Taken together such overall consistency in the findings serves to increase confidence in the potential value of a number of tests in the battery. Clearly, however, any operational uses of the tests or the performance criteria for evaluation and research application, would require validity studies based on more extensive and better quality outcome information from larger samples of pre-trial detainees. Nevertheless, the available evidence suggests that these assessment tools would serve as valuable supplements in helping to identify the needs of young offenders and in tailoring social services (e.g., guidance and counseling) to produce desired behavioral change.

---

* Reading grade level was also among the measures that provides respectable validities in the present and prior validity study (although somewhat more so here). However, direct comparisons for that variable are difficult to make because previous use of the measure was based on scores for the SAT or the CAT.

REFERENCES

Caplan, N. Delinquency and the perceived chances for achievement. Unpublished paper, 1966. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Freeberg, N. E. Assessment of disadvantaged adolescents: A different approach to research and evaluation measures. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 229-240.

Freeberg, N. E., & Reilly, R. R. Development of guidance measures for youth-work training program enrollees. Phase I: Measurement of program objectives and the development of criteria. Project Report 71-13. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

Freeberg, N. E., & Reilly, R. R. Validation of a test battery for youth-work training program enrollees. Research Memorandum 72-11. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

Freeberg, N. E. Development of assessment measures for use with youth-work training program enrollees. Phase II: Longitudinal validation. Project Report 74-1. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974.

Kaiser, H. F. The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1958, 23, 187-200.

Kelly, T., Madden, R., Gardner, E., & Rudman, H. Stanford Achievement Test: Form W, Intermediate I. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

Karp, J. M., & Sigel, I. Psychoeducational appraisal of disadvantaged children. Review of Educational Research, 1965, 35, 401-412.

Lennon, R. T. Testing and the culturally disadvantaged child. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.

National Committee on Children and Youth. Project Crossroads. Final Report. New York, New York: 1971.

Orchinik, C. W. The Philadelphia youth development day treatment center. Philadelphia, Pa.: The Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, 1969.

Rovner-Pieczenik, R. The first decade of experience: A synthesis of manpower R & D projects in criminal justice and corrections (1963-1973). U. S. Department of Labor, Office of Research and Development, Washington, D. C. April 1973.

Youth House, Inc. Group employability training specialized tasks project. Final Report. New York: December 1967.

APPENDIX

Criterion Questionnaire Items

(1) SOCIAL-COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT ITEMS

How have you been getting along with your family since leaving Youth House. (Parents, guardian(s), spouse.)

☐ No family . . . . [Go to item #46]

☐ Not too good-- Don't get along with your family at all

☐ Fair. You get by with them

☐ Get along great with your family-- no problems

About how much of <u>every ten dollars</u> you make do you put toward the family income [or how much when you did work]

_____
(Amount)

On this list that I show you let me know which of these people or places have been giving you a hard time lately

_____ Supervisor at work

_____ People you work with

_____ Social worker (Welfare)

_____ State employment

_____ School (like teachers or other people that run the school)

_____ The police or the courts

_____ Lawyers

_____ Credit collection outfits

_____ Storekeepers

_____ Somebody in your family

_____ A hospital, or people that work in a hospital clinic (like the doctors; the clerks)

_____ Neighbors or other people you know in your neighborhood

_____ Friends

Any others?_____

Do you have any ills or problems with your health that bother you

☐ No ☐ Yes

About how many times did you go to see a doctor--because you were sick--since you've been out of Youth House

_____
Number

Have you saved any money since you left Youth House

☐ All the time (out of just about every paycheck)
☐ Some--off and on
☐ Just about nothing saved

Have you gotten in any trouble with the police since you left Youth House (arrested, charged or booked)

☐ No ☐ Just once ☐ A couple of times ☐ More than a couple of times

Any convictions since you left Youth House

☐ None ☐ One conviction ☐ A couple of convictions ☐ More than a couple

How important is it to you to keep out of trouble with the cops and the law

☐ Real important: you go out of your way to avoid trouble
☐ You usually try to steer clear unless you're pushed hard
☐ Not too important. If you get in trouble with the cops, it doesn't matter much

Do you spend any time in places like these

			How many hours during the week
• YMCA (Boys Club)	☐ No	☐ Yes	_____
• PAL	☐ No	☐ Yes	_____
• School Recreation Program after class (sports or clubs)	☐ No	☐ Yes	_____
• Boy Scouts	☐ No	☐ Yes	_____
• Social Club or Gang in my neighborhood	☐ No	☐ Yes	_____
• Work-training program (like NYC, COPE, or MTDA)	☐ No	☐ Yes	_____
• Church activities (clubs, CYO)	☐ No	☐ Yes	_____
• Other _____ list	☐ No	☐ Yes	_____

Does he make trouble for you or other people in the family?

☐ Never makes any trouble ☐ Sometimes he makes trouble ☐ He's always making trouble at home

Is he likely to do something that would land him back in the Youth House?

☐ Not much chance of that ☐ He might ☐ It's a good bet that he will

(2) WORK EXPERIENCE AND ADJUSTMENT ITEMS

How have you made out since you left Youth House . . . . .

☐ Are you working now [20 hrs. a week or more]

☐ Not working now, but have held job since you left Youth House [20 hrs. a week or more, for at least one week]

☐ Not working; have not held job

What kind of business is that _____

What kind of work do (did) you do _____
Title [description where needed]

How many hours a week do (did) you work _____

How long on that job _____ [Weeks or months]

How many jobs held since leaving Youth House _____

Did you get a raise in pay on your present (or last) job

☐ No ☐ Yes Number of raises _____

Did you get a promotion on that job ☐ No ☐ Yes

What are your feelings about the kind of work you do (did)

☐ It's great: like it a lot ☐ It's okay ☐ Don't like the work at all

How's your pay for the kind of work you do (did)

☐ Good pay for the kind of job you have (had) ☐ Just about what it should be for the job ☐ A lot less than the job is (was) worth

If you have your way would you want to work for this place five years from now

☐ Definitely no ☐ Not sure: depends on how things go ☐ Yes you would

Do (did) you feel like you're really part of the company (like you really belong)

☐ That's just the way you feel (felt) ☐ Maybe sometimes you feel (felt) that way ☐ No--just another job

How close does (did) your work come to the way you think a job should be

☐ Nowhere near what you think a job should be ☐ Sometimes close to what a job should be ☐ It's just the way you think working on a job should be

How good is (was) your pay if you compare it with what you could get at other companies for the same kind of work

- ☐ Better pay than other companies for the kind of work
- ☐ About the same pay as other companies
- ☐ Less than other places pay for that kind of work

When you took a job in the company--if you knew then what you know now about it--would you have gone to work there

- ☐ No--not if you knew about the place what you know now
- ☐ Not too sure
- ☐ Yes, you would take a job there again

Based on your age, your ability and your experience, how do (did) you feel about your pay

- ☐ More pay than a guy like you would expect to make
- ☐ About where you should be in salary
- ☐ Making less than a guy with your experience should expect to make

When you finish a day's work, do (did) you feel like you did something worthwhile

- ☐ Almost never feel (felt) that way
- ☐ Sometimes true
- ☐ Almost always feel (felt) that way

About how much do (did) you make on your job per hour when you started [for present job or last job held]

- ☐ $1.25 to $1.50/hr.
- ☐ $1.50 to $1.75/hr.
- ☐ $1.75 to $2.00/hr.
- ☐ $2.00 to $2.50/hr.
- ☐ More than $2.50/hr.

How close have you come to doing what you thought you would when you left Youth House--as far as your job goes

- ☐ Much better than you thought you would do
- ☐ About what you expected you would do
- ☐ Worse than you expected to do

(3) WORK PLANNING AND MOTIVATION ITEMS

How long were you out of Youth House before you got the first job _____ [days or weeks]

Which of these did you try to get help from--to get your first job

- ☐ Youth House project personnel
- ☐ State employment
- ☐ Told about by friends or people in the neighborhood
- ☐ Told about by family
- ☐ Looked at newspaper want ad
- ☐ Looked for sign in store window
- ☐ Employment agency where you pay
- ☐ Church and community leaders (like store owners, school teachers or ministers)
- ☐ Just went to companies and asked about jobs
- ☐ Other _____

Which one of those was the way you actually got the first job

_____

How many places did you actually get to see someone to ask about a job before you got the first job

_____

In how many places did you actually get to fill out an application before you got the first job

_____

[Presently employed]

What plans do you have for about the next six months or so (anyone or combination)

- ☐ Keep working on my job (No particular plans)
- ☐ Look for a better job
- ☐ Try to get some extra training (on the job or part-time school)
- ☐ Go to school full time

[Presently unemployed]

What plans do you have for about the next six months or so

- ☐ No particular plans
- ☐ Try to find another job full-time
- ☐ Go to school full-time
- ☐ Find a job and go to school

What kind of job would you look for if you have to leave this one

- ☐ Don't know

[Try for job choice]

_____
(Type of job)

What kind of job are you looking for, mainly (or what would you look for when you do look)

- ☐ Don't know

[Try for job choice]

_____
(Type of job)

What's the most important reason that you picked that job _____
[Single response]

How much do you know about what it takes to do that job

- ☐ A lot about that kind of work
- ☐ Know a few things about what that job takes
- ☐ Don't really know much about it

What would you do to get that next job [Prompt only by asking "Anything else"?] List as many items as given.

- ☐ Don't know

_____ _____

_____ _____

What kind of work do you plan to be doing over a longer time--like five to ten years from now

☐ Don't know (don't plan that far ahead)

☐ Same kind of work you're doing now (or did in previous job)

☐ Something different Like What? _____

(Single Choice)

Did you get a general equivalency high school diploma (GED) since you left Youth House

☐ No ☐ Yes

↓

are you working on getting it

☐ No ☐ Yes

Did you visit the State Employment Service since you got out of Youth House

☐ No ☐ Yes . . . . _____ (Number of visits)

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

How many places have you lived since you left Youth House _____ (number)

Living with: [single response or appropriate combination]

☐ Mother ☐ Wife or Husband ☐ Stepmother

☐ Father ☐ Brother(s) or Sister(s) ☐ Stepfather

☐ Guardian ☐ Relatives and/or Friends ☐ Institution

☐ Children ☐ Live alone

Number of Interviewer Contacts Required to Locate Former Detainee

Phone calls _____ number

Home Visits _____ number

Other Contacts Attempted _____ number